arXiv:math/0011027v2 [math.AP] 15 Feb 2001

Fučik Spectrum for the Neumann Problem with Indefinite Weights

Mohssine ALIF [*]
Dép. Math., C.P. 214, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
1050 Bruxelles, Belgium
and
The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics,
Trieste, Italy

Abstract

We obtain a description of the Fučik spectrum associated to the one-dimensional asymmetric problem with indefinite weights $Lu = am(t)u^+ - bn(t)u^-$ in $]T_1, T_2[$, $u'(T_1) = 0 = u'(T_2)$, where L is a Sturm-Liouville operator. Our approach is based on the shooting method.

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the study of the Fučik spectrum Σ associated to the semilinear Neumann problem with weights

$$\begin{cases} Lu = am(t)u^+ - bn(t)u^- \text{ in }]T_1, T_2[, \\ u'(T_1) = 0 = u'(T_2), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $Lu := -[p(t)u']' + q(t)u$, p, q, m and $n \in C[T_1, T_2]$, $p(t) > 0$ on $[T_1, T_2]$, $q(t) \geq 0$ on $[T_1, T_2]$, $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ are both $\not\equiv 0$ and $u^{\pm} := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$. Σ is defined as the set of those $(a, b) \in I\!R^2$ such that the problem (1.1) has a nontrivial solution. This set plays an important role in the study of semilinear problems of type

$$\begin{cases} Lu = f(t, u(t)) \text{ in }]T_1, T_2[, \\ u'(T_1) = 0 = u'(T_2). \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

---

[*] e-mail: malif@ictp.trieste.it

Consider first the case where there is only one weight-function with a constant sign in the whole of the interval $[T_1, T_2]$, i.e. the case where $m(t) = n(t)$ and for instance $m(t) > 0$ on $[T_1, T_2]$. The problem (1.1) becomes:

$$\begin{cases} Lu = m(t)[au^+ - bu^-] \text{ in }]T_1, T_2[, \\ u'(T_1) = 0 = u'(T_2). \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

It is well known (see [4], [7], [11]) that, in this case, Σ is made of the two lines $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_1^m\}$ and $\{\lambda_1^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$ together with a sequence of hyperbolic like curves in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ passing through $(\lambda_k^m, \lambda_k^m)$, $k \geq 2$; each point $(\lambda_k^m, \lambda_k^m)$ belongs to one (or two) of these curves. Along this (or these two) curve(s), the corresponding solutions for (1.3) have exactly $(k-1)$-zeros in $]T_1, T_2[$. Here $(0 =)\lambda_1^m < \lambda_2^m \leq \ldots \to +\infty$ designate the sequence of eigenvalues of the linear problem associated to (1.3) :

$$\begin{cases} Lu = \lambda m(t) u \text{ in }]T_1, T_2[, \\ u'(T_1) = 0 = u'(T_2). \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

The description of Σ is explicit in the classical case where $Lu = -u''$ and $m(t) \equiv n(t) = 1$ (see [6], [7], [8]). In the second paragraph of section 3, we investigate the situation where the weight-function $m(t)$ changes sign in the interval $[T_1, T_2]$, i.e. when both m^+ and m^- are $\not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$. In this case, we prove that the description of Σ is rather comparable with that of the Fučik spectrum associated to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} Lu = m(t)[au^+ - bu^-] \text{ in }]T_1, T_2[, \\ u(T_1) = 0 = u(T_2) \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

which was studied recently in [1] and [2]: Σ is made of the four lines $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_1^m\}$, $\{\lambda_1^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_{-1}^m\}$ and $\{\lambda_{-1}^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$ together with a double sequence of hyperbolic like curves in both $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^-$ passing through $(\lambda_k^m, \lambda_k^m)$ and $(\lambda_{-k}^m, \lambda_{-k}^m)$, $k \geq 2$, and, moreover, a (non-zero) number of additional curves which appear in the other two quadrants $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^-$ and $\mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^+$. This number depends on "the number of changes of sign" of $m(t)$ in the interval $[T_1, T_2]$. More precisely, if $m(t)$ "changes sign $N(= 1, 2, ..., +\infty)$-times" in $]T_1, T_2[$, then Σ contains exactly $(2N-1)$-hyperbolic like curves in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^-$ and also in $\mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^+$. These additional curves can be classified according to the number of zeros of the corresponding solutions of the problem (1.3). Here as below $-\infty \leftarrow \ldots \leq \lambda_{-2}^m < \lambda_{-1}^m$ $(\leq 0 \leq)$ $\lambda_1^m < \lambda_2^m \leq \ldots \to +\infty$ are the eigenvalues of the linear problem (1.4).

Let us return to the problem (1.1) and suppose that $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ both change sign in the interval $[T_1, T_2]$. As it was done for the Dirichlet case in [1] and [2], we prove in the first paragraph of section 3 that, beside the trivial part consisting of the four lines $\{\lambda_1^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_1^n\}$, $\{\lambda_{-1}^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_{-1}^n\}$, the Fučik spectrum Σ associated to (1.1) is made in each quadrant of $\mathbb{R}^2$ of *a (non-zero) odd or infinite number* of hyperbolic like curves. Moreover, p, q, r, s being in $\mathbb{N}$, we prove the existence of two weight-functions $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ such that the spectrum Σ associated to (1.1) exactly contains $(2p+1), (2q+1), (2r+1)$ and $(2s+1)$ hyperbolic like curves in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^-$, $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^-$ and $\mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^+$

respectively. Note that, here as above, certain curves may be double and are then counted for two.

Section 4 is mainly devoted to the study of the asymptotic behaviour of the "first curves" of Σ in each quadrant of $I\!\!R^2$, i.e. those which lie the closest to the trivial horizontal and vertical lines. In the Dirichlet case ([1], [2]), it was observed that for instance the first curve in $I\!\!R^+ \times I\!\!R^+$ is non-asymptotic on any side to the trivial horizontal and vertical lines *if and only if* both m^+ and n^+ have compact support in $[T_1, T_2]$. In our Neumann case, it turns out that this non-asymptotic character holds always true for the first curve in $I\!\!R^+ \times I\!\!R^+$ even if m^+ or n^+ do not have compact support in $[T_1, T_2]$.

Section 2, which has a preliminary character, deals with the linear equation

$$Lu = am(t)u \text{ in } I\!\!R. \tag{1.6}$$

We introduce, among others, two "zero-functions". The first one sends any zero of a nontrivial solution u of (1.6) onto "the following zero" of u; the second one sends any $a \in I\!\!R$ onto "the first zero" $> T_1$ of a nontrivial solution u of (1.6) satisfying $u'(T_1) = 0$. We investigate several properties of these functions.

2 Zero-Functions

Consider the linear equation (1.6) where L is defined as in the introduction and $m \in C[T_1, T_2]$, $m(t) \not\equiv 0$. From now on, in this section, it will be supposed that $p(t)$, $q(t)$ and the weight-function $m(t)$ are extended from $[T_1, T_2]$ to the whole of $I\!\!R$ preserving the continuity and the fact that $p_1 \le p(t) \le p_2$ and $0 \le q(t) \le q_2$ for some constants $p_1 > 0$, p_2 and q_2.
From standard results on the ordinary differential equations (cf. [5] or [9]), it follows that, for each $s \in I\!\!R$, there exists a unique solution $u(t) = u(t; a, s)$, $u(s) = 0$ and $u'(s) = 1$, of the problem (1.6).
Similarly, we have the existence and the unicity of $v(t) = v(t; a, s)$: solution of (1.6) such that $v'(s) = 0$ and $v(s) = 1$.
Moreover, $u(t; a, s)$ and $v(t; a, s)$ are both C^1-functions of (t, a, s).

Definition 2.1 We define the three zero-functions φ, ψ_1 and ψ_2 as follows

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \varphi_a(s) & := & \min\{t > s : u(t; a, s) = 0\}\,, \\ \psi_1(a) & := & \min\{t > T_1 : v(t; a, T_1) = 0\}\,, \\ \psi_2(a) & := & \sup\{t < T_2 : v(t; a, T_2) = 0\}\,, \end{array}$$

for each $(a, s) \in I\!\!R^2$, with $\varphi_a(s)$ (resp. $\psi_1(a)$) $= +\infty$ if $u(t; a, s)$ (resp. $v(t; a, T_1)$) does not have any zero $> s$ (resp. T_1). Similarly, $\psi_2(a) = -\infty$ if $v(t; a, T_2)$ does not vanish at any point $t < T_2$.

Note that $\varphi_a(s)$ (resp. $\psi_1(a)$) is in fact the first zero following s (resp. T_1) of, not only $u(.;a,s)$ (resp. $v(.;a,T_1)$), but also of any nontrivial solution u of (1.6) satisfying the initial condition $u(s)=0$ (resp. $u'(T_1)=0$).
Similarly, $\psi_2(a)$ is the last zero $< T_2$ of any solution $u \not\equiv 0$ of (1.6) satisfying $u'(T_2)=0$.
On the other hand, it follows from classical ODE results that the zeros of both u and v are isolated. Thus the above definitions are meaningful.

Notation 2.2 Let

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A & := & \{(a,s)\in I\!R^2 : \varphi_a(s) < +\infty\}, \\ B_1 & := & \{a \in I\!R : \psi_1(a) < +\infty\}, \\ B_2 & := & \{a \in I\!R : \psi_2(a) > -\infty\} \end{array}$$

and, for each $s \in I\!R$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \alpha_s^> & := & \inf\{t > s : m(t) > 0\}, \\ \alpha_s^< & := & \inf\{t > s : m(t) < 0\} \end{array}$$

with the convention: $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$.
In the simplest cases, $\alpha_s^>$ (resp. $\alpha_s^<$) is the lower bound of the first positive (resp. negative) bump of $m(t)$ situated at the right of s.

The zero-function φ has the following

Properties (see [1] or [2])

1) *(i)* *A is open,*
(ii) *$\varphi : A \longmapsto I\!R$ is a C^1-function.*

2) *(i)* *$\forall a \in I\!R$, $\varphi_a(s)$ is increasing with respect to s, strictly in A,*
(ii) *$\forall s \in I\!R$, $\varphi_a(s)$ is decreasing with respect to a for $a \geq 0$, strictly in A,*
(iii) *$\forall s \in I\!R$, $\varphi_a(s)$ is increasing with respect to a for $a \leq 0$, strictly in A.*

3) *(i)* *$\partial\varphi_a(s)/\partial s > 0$ for $(a,s) \in A$,*
(ii) *$\partial\varphi_a(s)/\partial a < 0$ for $(a,s) \in A$ and $a > 0$,*
(iii) *$\partial\varphi_a(s)/\partial a > 0$ for $(a,s) \in A$ and $a < 0$.*

4) *(i)* *$\forall s \in I\!R$, $\lim\limits_{a \longrightarrow +\infty} \varphi_a(s) = \alpha_s^>$,*
(ii) *$\forall s \in I\!R$, $\lim\limits_{a \longrightarrow -\infty} \varphi_a(s) = \alpha_s^<$.*

5) *$\forall s \in I\!R$, $\lim\limits_{a \longrightarrow 0} \varphi_a(s) = +\infty$.*

Remark 2.3 We will restrict ourselves below, in this section, to the study of ψ_1. By the change of variable "$\tilde{t} = -t$", one can easily deduce the properties of ψ_2 from those of ψ_1.

Indeed, let us denote $\tilde{v}(\tilde{t}) := v(-\tilde{t}) = v(t)$. By this change of variable, our equation (1.6) becomes: $-[p(-\tilde{t})\tilde{v}']' + q(-\tilde{t})\tilde{v} = am(-\tilde{t})\tilde{v}$.
Denote by $\tilde{\varphi}$, $\tilde{\psi}_1$ and $\tilde{\psi}_2$, respectively, the three zero-functions associated to the latter equation. It is clear that $\tilde{v}(\tilde{t},a,\tilde{s}) = -v(-\tilde{t},a,-\tilde{s})$, $\tilde{\psi}_1(a) = -\psi_2(a)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_2(a) = -\psi_1(a)$.

Hence, the conditions on $v(., a, T_2)$ at T_2 become initial conditions for $\tilde{v}(., a, -T_2)$ at $-T_2$ and $\psi_2(a) = -\tilde{\psi}_1(a)$. Q. E. D.

Now, we'll see that the properties of ψ_1 are similar to those of φ.

Property 1 *(i) B_1 is an open subset of $I\!R$,*
(ii) $\psi_1 : B_1 \longrightarrow I\!R$ is a C^1-function.

Proof. Let $a_0 \in B_1$. Note first that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t; a_0, T_1)/_{t=\psi_1(a_0)}$ can not be $= 0$. This is a direct consequence of standard uniqueness theorems for the ODE (see, e.g. [5] or [9]) and the fact that $v(\psi_1(a_0); a_0, T_1) = 0$ and $v(.; a_0, T_1) \not\equiv 0$. Hence using the implicit function theorem, one gets open neighbourhoods U of a_0 and V of $\psi_1(a_0)$ and a C^1-function $\tilde{\psi}_1 : U \longrightarrow V$ such that

$$\tilde{\psi}_1(a) = t \Longleftrightarrow (t, a) \in V \times U \text{ and } v(t; a, T_1) = 0\,.$$

Now by the same arguments used in [2] to prove property 1 of ϕ, we can show that $\tilde{\psi}_1 \equiv \psi_1$ near a_0 and that $U \subset B_1$, U being sufficiently reduced. Q. E. D.

The following two properties are concerned with the monotonicity and the regularity of ψ_1.

Property 2 *(i) ψ_1 is $\searrow$ in $I\!R^+$, strictly in $B_1 \cap I\!R^+$,*
(ii) ψ_1 is $\nearrow$ in $I\!R^-$, strictly in $B_1 \cap I\!R^-$.

Proof. We'll prove only the first assertion (the proof of the second one is similar). So let $a \in B_1 \cap I\!R^+$ and $\tilde{a} > a$ and let us verify that $\psi_1(\tilde{a}) < \psi_1(a)$. This will be clearly done if we succeed in proving that the solution $\tilde{v}(., \tilde{a}, T_1)$ of the linear equation

$$L\tilde{v} = \tilde{a} m(t) \tilde{v} \tag{2.1}$$

has at least one zero in the interval $]T_1, \psi_1(a)[$.
Writing the equations (1.6) and (2.1), respectively, as

$$-\frac{1}{a}[p(t)v']' + \frac{1}{a} q(t) v = m(t) v$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{\tilde{a}}[p(t)\tilde{v}']' + \frac{1}{\tilde{a}} q(t) \tilde{v} = m(t) \tilde{v}$$

and applying the following lemma to these two latters on the interval $[T_1, \psi_1(a)]$, one gets the desired result.
By the same arguments, we prove that if $\tilde{a} \geq a \geq 0$, then $\psi_1(\tilde{a}) \leq \psi_1(a)$. Property 2 is proved. Q. E. D.

The following lemma will be used below repeatedly.

Lemma 2.4 *Consider the following two equations:*

$$(*)_i \qquad -[p_i(t){v_i}']' + q_i(t)v_i = m_i(t)v_i,\ t \in I\!R,$$

$(i = 1, 2)$ and let v_1 and v_2 be two solutions of $(*)_1$ and $(*)_2$, respectively, such that

$$\begin{cases} v_i(T_1) &= 1\ , \\ {v_i}'(T_1) &= 0\ (i = 1, 2)\,. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $p_1 \geq p_2\,(> 0)$, $q_1 \geq q_2\,(\geq 0)$, $m_1 \leq m_2$ and that v_1 vanishes at a point $t_0 > T_1$. Then v_2 has at least one zero in the interval $]T_1, t_0]$.
If, moreover, at least one of the above three inequalities is strict, then v_2 has a zero in the open interval $]T_1, t_0[$.

Proof. Suppose $p_1 \geq p_2 > 0$, $q_1 \geq q_2 \geq 0$, $m_1 \leq m_2$ and suppose, by contradiction, that $v_1(t_0) = 0$ and v_2 does not have any zero in the interval $]T_1, t_0]$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that t_0 is the first zero $> T_1$ of v_1.
From the indentities

$$\begin{aligned} [p_1(t)v_1'v_2]' &= v_2[p_1(t)v_1']' + p_1(t)v_1'v_2' \\ &= q_1(t)v_1v_2 - m_1(t)v_1v_2 + p_1(t)v_1'v_2' \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [p_2(t)v_1v_2']' &= v_1[p_2(t)v_2']' + p_2(t)v_1'v_2' \\ &= q_2(t)v_1v_2 - m_2(t)v_1v_2 + p_2(t)v_1'v_2' \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$[p_1(t)v_1'v_2 - p_2(t)v_1v_2']' = [q_1(t) - q_2(t)]v_1v_2 - [m_1(t) - m_2(t)]v_1v_2 + [p_1(t) - p_2(t)]v_1'v_2'\ .$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tfrac{v_1}{v_2}[p_1(t)v_1'v_2 - p_2(t)v_1v_2']\right)' &= \tfrac{v_1}{v_2}([q_1(t) - q_2(t)]v_1v_2 \\ &- [m_1(t) - m_2(t)]v_1v_2 \\ &+ [p_1(t) - p_2(t)]v_1'v_2') \\ &+ \tfrac{v_1'v_2 - v_1v_2'}{v_2^2}[p_1(t)v_1'v_2 - p_2(t)v_1v_2']\ . \end{aligned}$$

So we establish the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tfrac{v_1}{v_2}[p_1(t)v_1'v_2 - p_2(t)v_1v_2']\right)' &= [q_1(t) - q_2(t)]v_1^2 \\ &- [m_1(t) - m_2(t)]v_1^2 \\ &+ [p_1(t) - p_2(t)]{v_1'}^2 \\ &+ p_2(t)[v_1' - v_2'\tfrac{v_1}{v_2}]^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

everywhere in the interval $]T_1, t_0]$.
Now, integrating (2.2) from T_1 to t_0, the first member leads to an integral equal to zero and the second one to an integral strictly positive: a contradiction.
Similarly, we prove that v_2 must have a zero in $]T_1, t_0[$ when at least one of the inequalities $p_1 \geq p_2$, $q_1 \geq q_2$, $m_1 \leq m_2$ is strict. Q. E. D.

Property 3 *(i)* $\psi_1'(a) < 0$ *for every* $a \in B_1 \cap I\!R^+$,
(ii) $\psi_1'(a) > 0$ *for every* $a \in B_1 \cap I\!R^-$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of the third property of φ (see [1] or [2]). We point out that, instead of Sturm's comparison theorem, one should use lemma 2.4 above. Q. E. D.

The following property will be very useful in the fourth section of this work. It concerns the behaviour of ψ_1 at ±∞.

Property 4 *(i)* $\lim_{a \longrightarrow +\infty} \psi_1(a) = \alpha_{T_1}^{>}$,
(ii) $\lim_{a \longrightarrow -\infty} \psi_1(a) = \alpha_{T_1}^{<}$.

To prove this property, we need the following two lemmas:

Lemma 2.5 *(i)* $\forall a \in I\!R_+, \psi_1(a) \geq \alpha_{T_1}^{>}$ *and if, moreover,* $a \in B_1$, *then we have the strict inequality.*
(ii) $\forall a \in I\!R_-, \psi_1(a) \geq \alpha_{T_1}^{<}$ *and if, moreover,* $a \in B_1$, *then we have the strict inequality.*

Lemma 2.6 $\forall a \in I\!R, \psi_1(a) \leq \varphi_a(T_1)$. *Moreover, if* $(a, T_1) \in A$, *then one has the strict inequality.*

Proof of property 4 (i) Let $a \geq 0$. From the last two lemmas, we deduce that

$$\alpha_{T_1}^{>} \leq \psi_1(a) \leq \varphi_a(T_1) \; .$$

Passing to the limit as $a \longrightarrow +\infty$ and using the fact that $\lim_{a \longrightarrow +\infty} \varphi_a(T_1) = \alpha_{T_1}^{>}$ (see property 4 of φ above), we conclude the proof of (i).
(ii) The proof of (ii) is similar to that of (i). Q. E. D.

Proof of lemma 2.5. Let us prove the first assertion (i) (the second one is proved similarly). Let $a \geq 0$ and suppose by contradiction that $\psi_1(a) < \alpha_{T_1}^{>}$. Then m is ≤ 0 on $[T_1, \psi_1(a)]$. Comparing on this interval our equation (1.6) with the equation $-p_1 v'' = 0.v$, it follows from lemma 2.4 that any solution v of the latter must have at least one zero in $]T_1, \psi_1(a)]$, which is clearly false.
By the same arguments, we prove that if moreover $a \in B_1$, then the strict inequality $\psi_1(a) > \alpha_{T_1}^{>}$ holds true. Q. E. D.

Proof of lemma 2.6. Let $a \in I\!R$ be such that $(a, T_1) \in A$. Applying Sturm's separation theorem as it is given for instance in ch. 11 of [9] to the functions $u(.; a, T_1)$ and $v(.; a, T_1)$, it follows that $v(.; a, T_1)$ has at least one zero in the interval $]T_1, \varphi_a(T_1)[$ and, hence, $\psi_1(a) < \varphi_a(T_1)$.
If $(a, T_1) \notin A$, then it is clear by the definition of A below that $\varphi_a(T_1) = +\infty$ and, hence, $\psi_1(a) \leq \varphi_a(T_1)$. Lemma 2.6 is proved. Q. E. D.

Property 5 $\lim_{a \longrightarrow 0} \psi_1(a) = +\infty$.

Proof. Let us treat the case where $a \geq 0$ (the case $a \leq 0$ can be reduced to this one by considering $-m$).
Let $R > 0$. It is clear that there exists $a_R > 0$ such that $am(t) \leq p_1(\pi/R)^2$ for every $0 \leq a \leq a_R$, where p_1 is defined at the beginning of this section.
Let us compare, on $[T_1, T_1 + R]$, the equations (1.6) and

$$-p_1 v'' + 0.v = p_1(\pi/R)^2 v. \tag{2.3}$$

The function $v(t) := \sin(\pi\frac{t-T_1}{R} + \frac{\pi}{2})$ is clearly a solution of (2.3) satisfying $v'(T_1) = 0$ and whose first zero $> T_1$ is exactly the point $T_1 + \frac{R}{2}$. Using lemma 2.4, this implies that $\psi_1(a) \geq T_1 + \frac{R}{2}$. Property 5 is then proved since R is arbitrary. Q. E. D.

Consequence 2.7 *From the remark 2.3 and the properties of ψ_1 presented above, we deduce the following results concerning the zero-function ψ_2:*

1) *B_2 is an open subset of $I\!R$ and $\psi_2 : B_2 \longmapsto I\!R$ is a C^1-function,*
2) *ψ_2 is $\nearrow$ (resp. $\searrow$) in $I\!R_+$ (resp. $I\!R_-$), strictly in $B_2 \cap I\!R_+$ (resp. $B_2 \cap I\!R_-$),*
3) *$\psi_2'(a)$ is > 0 if $a \in B_2 \cap I\!R_+$ and < 0 if $a \in B_2 \cap I\!R_-$,*
4) $\lim_{a \longrightarrow +\infty} \psi_2(a) = \sup\{t < T_2 : m(t) > 0\}$ *and , similarly,*
   $\lim_{a \longrightarrow -\infty} \psi_2(a) = \sup\{t < T_2 : m(t) < 0\}$,
5) $\lim_{a \longrightarrow 0} \psi_2(a) = -\infty$.

Before closing this section, note that the restrictions of

φ_a to $\{s \in [T_1, T_2] : \varphi_a(s) \in [T_1, T_2]\}$,
ψ_1 to $\{a \in I\!R : \psi_1(a) \in [T_1, T_2]\}$ and
ψ_2 to $\{a \in I\!R : \psi_2(a) \in [T_1, T_2]\}$,

clearly, do not depend on the extensions of the coefficients of L and the weight-function $m(t)$ introduced at the beginning of this section.
On the other hand, since φ, ψ_1 and ψ_2 depend on the weight-function $m(t)$, we will note them below by φ^m, ψ_1^m and ψ_2^m respectively.
Finally we denote by λ_1^m (resp. λ_{-1}^m) the principal positive (resp. negative) eigenvalue of the problem (1.4) when $m^+(t)$ (resp. $m^-(t)$) $\not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$.

Remark 2.8 When $q \equiv 0$ and m changes sign in $[T_1, T_2]$, it is well known that (at least) one of these principal eigenvalues is equal to zero and the "sign" of the other one depends on the "average of the weight m" on the interval $[T_1, T_2]$. More precisely, in this case,

.) if $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} m(t)dt = 0$, then $\lambda_{-1}^m = 0 = \lambda_1^m$,
.) if $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} m(t)dt > 0$, then $\lambda_{-1}^m < 0$ and $\lambda_1^m = 0$,
.) if $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} m(t)dt < 0$, then $\lambda_{-1}^m = 0$ and $\lambda_1^m > 0$

(see, e.g., [3] or [12]).

When $q \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ and m changes sign in $[T_1, T_2]$, it is clear that 0 can not be an eigenvalue of the problem (1.4) and, moreover, $\lambda_{-1}^m < 0$ and $\lambda_1^m > 0$ (see, e.g. [10] for more details).

3 Nonlinear problem with weights

This section is devoted to the study of the description of the Fučik spectrum Σ in the Neumann case. In the first paragraph, we consider the problem with two weight-functions (1.1) and in the second one, we investigate the particular case where one weight is considered, i.e. the problem (1.3).

3.1 Two-weights problem

Consider in this paragraph the semilinear problem (1.1), where L, m and n are defined as before. From standard ODE results it follows that the zeros of any nontrivial solution of (1.1) are isolated. Hence, we can classify these solutions according to their numbers of zeros in the interval $]T_1, T_2[$. This leads us to the following description of the spectrum Σ:

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty} (C_k^> \cup C_k^<) ,$$

where $C_k^>$ (resp. $C_k^<$) is the set of those (a, b) in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that (1.1) has a nontrivial solution u with exactly k-zeros in $]T_1, T_2[$ and ending positively (resp. negatively), i.e. such that: $u(T_2) > 0$ (resp. $u(T_2) < 0$).

On the other hand, if $(a, b) \in C_k^>$ (resp. $C_k^<$), then all the solutions of (1.1) ending positively (resp. negatively) are multiple one of the other. This allows us to describe $C_k^>$ and $C_k^<$, $k \geq 1$, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
C_1^> & := & \{(a,b) : \psi_1^n(b) = \psi_2^m(a)\} , \\
C_2^> & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_b^n[\psi_1^m(a)] = \psi_2^m(a)\} , \\
C_3^> & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_b^n(\varphi_a^m[\psi_1^n(b)]) = \psi_2^m(a)\} , \\
C_4^> & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_b^n(\varphi_a^m[\varphi_b^n(\psi_1^m(a))]) = \psi_2^m(a)\} \ \ldots
\end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
C_1^< & := & \{(a,b) : \psi_1^m(a) = \psi_2^n(b)\} , \\
C_2^< & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_a^m[\psi_1^n(b)] = \psi_2^n(b)\} , \\
C_3^< & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_a^m(\varphi_b^n[\psi_1^m(a)]) = \psi_2^n(b)\} , \\
C_4^< & := & \{(a,b) : \varphi_a^m(\varphi_b^n[\varphi_a^m(\psi_1^n(b))]) = \psi_2^n(b)\} \ \ldots
\end{array}$$

Concerning the sets $C_0^>$ and $C_0^<$, it is clear that $C_0^>$ (resp. $C_0^<$) is made of one or two of the lines $\{\lambda_1^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\{\lambda_{-1}^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_1^n\}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{\lambda_{-1}^n\}$): it depends on the sign of $m(t)$ (resp. $n(t)$). More precisely,

./ If $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ everywhere in $[T_1, T_2]$, then $C_0^> = \{\lambda_1^m\} \times \mathbb{R}$.

./ If $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\leq} 0$ everywhere in $[T_1, T_2]$, then $C_0^> = \{\lambda_{-1}^m\} \times I\!R$.

./ If m changes sign in $[T_1, T_2]$, i.e. if $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ and $m^-(t) \not\equiv 0$ on $[T_1, T_2]$, then $C_0^> = (\{\lambda_{-1}^m\} \times I\!R) \cup (\{\lambda_1^m\} \times I\!R)$.

Similarly,

.) $C_0^< = I\!R \times \{\lambda_1^n\}$ if $n \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ everywhere in $[T_1, T_2]$,

.) $C_0^< = I\!R \times \{\lambda_{-1}^n\}$ if $n \underset{\not\equiv}{\leq} 0$ everywhere in $[T_1, T_2]$,

.) $C_0^< = (I\!R \times \{\lambda_{-1}^n\}) \cup (I\!R \times \{\lambda_1^n\})$ if n changes sign in $[T_1, T_2]$.

From now on, we will denote by Σ^* the set Σ without these trivial lines, i.e.

$$\Sigma^* := \bigcup_{k=1}^{+\infty} (C_k^> \cup C_k^<) \,.$$

Remark 3.1 If for instance $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ and $n^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$, then it follows from the monotonicity properties of the zero-functions that the intersection of Σ with $I\!R^+ \times I\!R^+$ is contained in the quadrant $]\lambda_1^m, +\infty[\times]\lambda_1^n, +\infty[$. In fact, we can say more, namely this inclusion is **always strict**, i.e. there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\Sigma^* \cap (I\!R^+ \times I\!R^+) \subset]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[\times]\lambda_1^n + \epsilon, +\infty[$ (see next section for more details): This is the most important difference between the Dirichlet case and the Neumann case which is the subject of this work. Indeed, it was proved in [2] that this inclusion is strict in the Dirichlet case **if and only if** $m^+(t)$ and $n^+(t)$ both have compact support in the interval $]T_1, T_2[$.

Now let us return to our Neumann case. If $m^+(t) \equiv 0$ and $n^+(t) \equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$, then Σ^* does not contain any point of $I\!R^+ \times I\!R^+$.
We have similar results for the other three quadrants of $I\!R^2$: For instance, if $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ both change sign, then Σ^* is contained strictly in the four quadrants

$$(]\lambda_1^m, +\infty[\times]\lambda_1^n, +\infty[) \cup (]-\infty, \lambda_{-1}^m[\times]-\infty, \lambda_{-1}^n[)$$

$$\cup(]-\infty, \lambda_{-1}^m[\times]\lambda_1^n, +\infty[) \cup (]\lambda_1^m, +\infty[\times]-\infty, \lambda_{-1}^n[).$$

When one of the weight-functions $m(t)$ or $n(t)$ changes sign, the other one being with a constant sign in $]T_1, T_2[$, Σ^* is contained strictly in two quadrants.
When these two weights do not change sign, Σ^* is contained strictly in one quadrant.

We will note below:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Psi_1^>(a,b) & := & \psi_1^n(b)\,, \\ \Psi_2^>(a,b) & := & \varphi_b^n[\psi_1^m(a)]\,, \\ \Psi_3^>(a,b) & := & \varphi_b^n(\varphi_a^m[\psi_1^n(b)])\,, \\ \Psi_4^>(a,b) & := & \varphi_b^n(\varphi_a^m[\varphi_b^n(\psi_1^m(a))])\ \ldots \end{array}$$

and, similarly,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Psi_1^<(a,b) & := & \psi_1^m(a)\,, \\ \Psi_2^<(a,b) & := & \varphi_a^m[\psi_1^n(b)]\,, \\ \Psi_3^<(a,b) & := & \varphi_a^m(\varphi_b^n[\psi_1^m(a)])\,, \\ \Psi_4^<(a,b) & := & \varphi_a^m(\varphi_b^n[\varphi_a^m(\psi_1^n(b))])\ \ldots \end{array}$$

So we have:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} C_k^> & = & \{(a,b)\in I\!R^2 : \Psi_k^>(a,b)=\psi_2^m(a)\} \text{ and} \\ C_k^< & = & \{(a,b)\in I\!R^2 : \Psi_k^<(a,b)=\psi_2^n(b)\} \end{array}$$

for every $k \geq 1$.

Taking into account of the fact that the zero-functions $\varphi_.(T_1)$ and $\psi_1(.)$ have similar properties, as it is shown in the preceding section, and proceeding as in the Dirichlet case ([1], [2] section 2), we conclude that the properties of Σ in our Neumann case are rather comparable with those of Σ in the Dirichlet case.
We point out that the asymptotic behaviour of Σ represents an exception of these properties (see remark 3.1). This is the principal reason for which we will devote the following section to this fact.
So we present below the properties of the Fučik spectrum associated to (1.1). We refer to [1] for detailed proofs and [2] for the proofs of analogous results in the Dirichlet case.

The first theorem shows that Σ^* is made, in each quadrant of $I\!R^2$, of hyperbolic like curves of class C^1.

Theorem 1 *Let $k \geq 1$ be such that $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_+ \times I\!R_+)$ is nonempty. Then there exist $\alpha_k^> \geq \lambda_1^m$, $\beta_k^> \geq \lambda_1^n$ and a C^1-diffeomorphism $f_k^>$ strictly ↘ defined from $]\alpha_k^>, +\infty[$ to $]\beta_k^>, +\infty[$ such that*

$$C_k^> \cap (I\!R_+ \times I\!R_+) = \{(a, f_k^>(a)) : a \in]\alpha_k^>, +\infty[\}.$$

Similarly for $C_k^<$.
We have similar results for the other three quadrants of $I\!R^2$. If for instance $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_- \times I\!R_+) \not\equiv \emptyset$, then there exist $\gamma_k^< \leq \lambda_{-1}^m$, $\eta_k^< \geq \lambda_1^n$ and a C^1-diffeomorphism $g_k^<$ strictly ↗ defined from $]-\infty, \gamma_k^<[$ to $]\eta_k^<, +\infty[$ such that $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_- \times I\!R_+) = \{(a, g_k^<(a)) : a \in]-\infty, \gamma_k^<[\}$.

In the following two theorems, we give some informations on the "exact number" of these curves in each quadrant of $I\!R^2$ and their positions with respect to each other.

Theorem 2 *Let $k \geq 1$ and ϵ_1, $\epsilon_2 \in \{+,-\}$. Then the following two assertions are equivalent:*
(i) $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ **and** *$C_k^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ are both nonempty,*
*(ii) $C_{k+1}^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ (***or** *$C_{k+1}^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$) is nonempty.*
On the other hand, both $C_k^>$ and $C_k^<$ are strictly above (resp. below) $C_{k+1}^>$ (or $C_{k+1}^<$) in the quadrants $I\!R_+ \times I\!R_+$ and $I\!R_- \times I\!R_+$ (resp. $I\!R_+ \times I\!R_-$ and $I\!R_- \times I\!R_-$).

Theorem 3 *Let* $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{+,-\}$ *and suppose that* $m^{\epsilon_1}(t) \not\equiv 0$ *and* $n^{\epsilon_2}(t) \not\equiv 0$. *Then one, at least, of the two intersections* $C_1^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *or* $C_1^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *is nonempty.*

Combining theorems 2 and 3 yields the following

Consequence 3.2 *Let* $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{+,-\}$ *and suppose* $m^{\epsilon_1}(t) \not\equiv 0$ *and* $n^{\epsilon_2}(t) \not\equiv 0$. *Then either*

(i) For every integer k*, the intersections* $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *and* $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *are both nonempty,*

or

(ii) There exists k_0 *for which* $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *and* $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *are both nonempty for every* $k \leq k_0$*, one of the two intersections* $C_{k_0+1}^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *or* $C_{k_0+1}^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *is nonempty, the other one being empty, and* $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *and* $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *are both empty for every* $k \geq k_0 + 2$.

In particular, we conclude that if both $m(t)$ *and* $n(t)$ *change sign, then the spectrum* Σ^* *consists, in each quadrant of* $I\!R^2$*, of* **a (non-zero) odd or infinite number** *of hyperbolic like curves* $C_k^>, C_k^< (k \geq 1)$.

Remark 3.3 Note that certain curves may be double and are then counted for two.

The following theorem gives a sufficient and (almost) necessary condition on $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ in order to have, in a given quadrant of $I\!R^2$, an infinite number of curves of Σ^* (see [1] for a more general condition which is necessary and sufficient).

Theorem 4 *Let* $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{+,-\}$ *and suppose that* $m^{\epsilon_1}(t).n^{\epsilon_2}(t) \not\equiv 0$ *in* $[T_1, T_2]$. *Then the two intersections* $C_k^> \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *and* $C_k^< \cap (I\!R_{\epsilon_1} \times I\!R_{\epsilon_2})$ *are both nonempty for every* $k \geq 1$.
Moreover, if at least one of the two graphes of $m^{\epsilon_1}(t)$ *or* $n^{\epsilon_2}(t)$ *is made of a finite number of bumps, then the converse is true.*

The last result shows that all situations may happen concerning the number of curves of Σ^* contained in each quadrant of $I\!R^2$.

Theorem 5 *Let* $p, q, r, s \in I\!N \cup \{+\infty\}$. *Then there exist two continuous weight-functions* $m(t)$ *and* $n(t)$ *on* $[T_1, T_2]$ *such that the intersection between the spectrum* Σ^* *associated to the problem (1.1) and* $I\!R_+ \times I\!R_+$ *(resp.* $I\!R_+ \times I\!R_-$, $I\!R_- \times I\!R_-$, $I\!R_- \times I\!R_+$*) exactly contains* $2p+1$ *(resp.* $2q+1$, $2r+1$, $2s+1$*) hyperbolic like curves.*

3.2 Particular case where $m(t) \equiv n(t)$

Now, let us consider the problem (1.3) where L is defined as before and $m \in C[T_1, T_2]$, $m(t) \not\equiv 0$. Making $a = b$ in (1.3), we find the eigenvalue problem (1.4) and, hence, we conclude that Σ intersected by the diagonal "$y = x$" consists of the sequence of points $(\lambda_k^m, \lambda_k^m)$, $k \geq 1$, if $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ and $(\lambda_{-k}^m, \lambda_{-k}^m)$, $k \geq 1$, if $m^-(t) \not\equiv 0$. Moreover, it is clear

that $(\lambda_k^m, \lambda_k^m) \in (C_{k-1}^> \cap C_{k-1}^<) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $(\lambda_{-k}^m, \lambda_{-k}^m) \in (C_{k-1}^> \cap C_{k-1}^<) \cap \mathbb{R}_-^2$ for every $k \geq 1$. This implies that:
(i) if $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$, then all the intersections of $C_k^>$ and of $C_k^<$ with $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ are nonempty,
(ii) if $m^-(t) \not\equiv 0$, then all the intersections of $C_k^>$ and of $C_k^<$ with $\mathbb{R}_-^2$ are nonempty.
In particular, if $m(t)$ does not change sign in the interval $[T_1, T_2]$ and if $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ (resp. $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\leq} 0$), then Σ^* contains an infinite number of curves in the quadrant $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}_-^2$).

From now on, we suppose that the weight-function $m(t)$ **changes sign**, i.e. m^+ and m^- are both $\not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$.
Using theorem 1, it follows from the points (i) and (ii) above that Σ^* contains an infinite number of curves in each one of the quadrants $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $\mathbb{R}_-^2$. Moreover, using the fact that Σ^* is symmetric with respect to the diagonal "$y = x$", it follows from the consequence 3.2 that: either (i) Σ^* contains a (non-zero) odd number of hyperbolic like curves in each one of the two quadrants $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-$ and $\mathbb{R}_- \times \mathbb{R}_+$, or (ii) there exists an infinite number of hyperbolic like curves in each one of these two quadrants.

We close this section by the following theorem which shows that the "exact number" of these additional curves in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-$ and in $\mathbb{R}_- \times \mathbb{R}_+$ depends on the "number of changes of sign" of $m(t)$ in the interval $]T_1, T_2[$.
Let us first precise this notion of "number of changes of sign".

Definition 3.4 **(1)** Let $s \in]T_1, T_2[$. We say that s is a *simple* point of change of sign of m when there exist $T_1 < s' \leq s$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that: either (i) $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\leq} 0$ on $]s' - \epsilon, s'[, \forall 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $m \equiv 0$ on $[s', s]$ and $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ on $]s, s + \epsilon[, \forall 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, or (ii) $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$ on $]s' - \epsilon, s'[$ for every $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $m \equiv 0$ on $[s', s]$ and $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\leq} 0$ on $]s, s + \epsilon[$ for every $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$.
(2) Let $s \in [T_1, T_2]$. We say that s is a *multiple* point of change of sign of m if either (i) $s > T_1$ and m^+ and m^- are both $\not\equiv 0$ on $]s - \epsilon, s[\cap [T_1, T_2]$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, or (ii) $s < T_2$ and m^+ and m^- are $\not\equiv 0$ on $]s, s + \epsilon[\cap [T_1, T_2]$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.
(3) If m has only simple points of change of sign in $]T_1, T_2[$ and if $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is the exact number of these points, then we say that the number of changes of sign of m is equal to N. If m has, at least, one multiple point of change of sign in $[T_1, T_2]$, then we say that the number of changes of sign of m is $+\infty$.

Hence we have the following

Theorem 6 *Suppose that m changes sign in the interval $]T_1, T_2[$. Let $N \in \{1, 2, ..., +\infty\}$ be the number of changes of sign of m. Then the spectrum Σ^* exactly contains $(2N - 1)$-hyperbolic like curves in each one of the two quadrants $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-$ and $\mathbb{R}_- \times \mathbb{R}_+$.*

4 Asymptotic behaviour of the first curves of Σ

This section is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behaviour of the first curves $C_1^> \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2})$ and $C_1^< \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2})$, where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{+, -\}$, of the Fučik spectrum Σ associated to the problem (1.3). We will see that none of the first curves can be asymptotic on any side to the trivial lines of Σ.
We denote

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T_1^> & := & \inf\{t \in]T_1, T_2[: m(t) > 0\}, \\ T_2^> & := & \sup\{t \in]T_1, T_2[: m(t) > 0\} \end{array}$$

when $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$, and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T_1^< & := & \inf\{t \in]T_1, T_2[: m(t) < 0\}, \\ T_2^< & := & \sup\{t \in]T_1, T_2[: m(t) < 0\} \end{array}$$

when $m^-(t) \not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$.
For every $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{+, -\}$, we set

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (C_1^>)_{(\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2)} & := & C_1^> \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}), \\ (C_1^<)_{(\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2)} & := & C_1^< \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}). \end{array}$$

For example, $(C_1^<)_{(-,+)} := C_1^< \cap (\mathbb{R}_- \times \mathbb{R}_+)$.

Finally, we denote

(i) $\alpha_1^>$ (resp. $\alpha_1^<$) the real > 0 (resp. < 0) for which $\psi_2(\alpha_1^>) = T_1^>$ (resp. $\psi_2(\alpha_1^<) = T_1^>$),

(ii) $\beta_1^>$ (resp. $\beta_1^<$) the real > 0 (resp. < 0) for which $\psi_1(\beta_1^>) = T_2^>$ (resp. $\psi_1(\beta_1^<) = T_2^>$)

if $m^+(t) \not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$, and

(iii) $\alpha_2^>$ (resp. $\alpha_2^<$) the real > 0 (resp. < 0) for which $\psi_2(\alpha_2^>) = T_1^<$ (resp. $\psi_2(\alpha_2^<) = T_1^<$),

(iv) $\beta_2^>$ (resp. $\beta_2^<$) the real > 0 (resp. < 0) for which $\psi_1(\beta_2^>) = T_2^<$ (resp. $\psi_1(\beta_2^<) = T_2^<$)

if $m^-(t) \not\equiv 0$ in $[T_1, T_2]$.
Note that the unicity of these reals clearly follows from the strict monotonicity of the zero-functions ψ_1 and ψ_2.

Theorem 7 *(i) If $(C_1^>)_{(+,+)} \neq \emptyset$, then $(C_1^>)_{(+,+)}$ is asymptotic to the lines $\{\alpha_1^>\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{\beta_1^>\}$.*

(ii) If $(C_1^>)_{(-,-)} \neq \emptyset$, then $(C_1^>)_{(-,-)}$ is asymptotic to the lines $\{\alpha_2^<\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{\beta_2^<\}$.

(iii) If $(C_1^>)_{(+,-)} \neq \emptyset$, then $(C_1^>)_{(+,-)}$ is asymptotic to the lines $\{\alpha_2^>\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} \times \{\beta_1^<\}$.

(iv) If $(C_1^>)_{(-,+)} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $(C_1^>)_{(-,+)}$ *is asymptotic to the lines* $\{\beta_2^>\} \times I\!R$ *and* $I\!R \times \{\alpha_1^<\}$.

And, by symmetry of $C_1^>$ *and* $C_1^<$ *with respect to the diagonal "*$y = x$*", we have also:*

(i)' If $(C_1^<)_{(+,+)} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $(C_1^<)_{(+,+)}$ *is asymptotic to the lines* $\{\beta_1^>\} \times I\!R$ *and* $I\!R \times \{\alpha_1^>\}$.

(ii)' If $(C_1^<)_{(-,-)} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $(C_1^<)_{(-,-)}$ *is asymptotic to the lines* $\{\beta_2^<\} \times I\!R$ *and* $I\!R \times \{\alpha_2^<\}$.

(iii)' If $(C_1^<)_{(+,-)} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $(C_1^<)_{(+,-)}$ *is asymptotic to the lines* $\{\alpha_1^<\} \times I\!R$ *and* $I\!R \times \{\beta_2^>\}$.

(iv)' If $(C_1^<)_{(-,+)} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $(C_1^<)_{(-,+)}$ *is asymptotic to the lines* $\{\beta_1^<\} \times I\!R$ *and* $I\!R \times \{\alpha_2^>\}$.

Proof. Let $(a, b) \in C_1$. Then $\psi_1(b) = \psi_2(a)$ if $(a, b) \in C_1^>$, or $\psi_1(a) = \psi_2(b)$ if $(a, b) \in C_1^<$.
Passing to the limits as $a \longrightarrow \pm\infty$ and as $b \longrightarrow \pm\infty$ and using the property 4 above and the fact that ψ_1 and ψ_2 are strictly monotonous, one can easily prove all the assertions of theorem 7. Q. E. D.

Corollary 4.1 *If* $m(t)$ *changes sign in* $[T_1, T_2]$*, then there exists an* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that*

$$\Sigma^* \subset (]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[\times]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[) \cup (] - \infty, \lambda_{-1}^m - \epsilon[\times] - \infty, \lambda_{-1}^m - \epsilon[)$$
$$\cup (] - \infty, \lambda_{-1}^m - \epsilon[\times]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[) \cup (]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[\times] - \infty, \lambda_{-1}^m - \epsilon[).$$

If $m(t)$ *keeps a constant sign in* $[T_1, T_2]$ *(for instance* $m \underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$*), then*

$$\Sigma^* \subset]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[\times]\lambda_1^m + \epsilon, +\infty[$$

for a certain $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $m(t)$ changes sign in $[T_1, T_2]$. We denote

$\alpha^>$ the real > 0 for which $\psi_2(\alpha^>) = T_1$,
$\alpha^<$ the real < 0 for which $\psi_2(\alpha^<) = T_1$,
$\beta^>$ the real > 0 for which $\psi_1(\beta^>) = T_2$,
$\beta^<$ the real < 0 for which $\psi_1(\beta^<) = T_2$.

Hence, by the monotonicity of the zero-functions ψ_1 and ψ_2, it is clear that:

$\alpha_1^>, \alpha_2^> \geq \alpha^> > \lambda_1^m$;
$\alpha_1^<, \alpha_2^< \leq \alpha^< < \lambda_{-1}^m$;
$\beta_1^>, \beta_2^> \geq \beta^> > \lambda_1^m$ and
$\beta_1^<, \beta_2^< \leq \beta^< < \lambda_{-1}^m$.

So, in this case, one has just to take $\epsilon := \min\{\alpha^> - \lambda_1^m, \lambda_{-1}^m - \alpha^<, \beta^> - \lambda_1^m, \lambda_{-1}^m - \beta^<\}$.
If $m(t)$ is $\underset{\not\equiv}{\geq} 0$, then we take, for example, $\epsilon := \min\{\alpha^> - \lambda_1^m, \beta^> - \lambda_1^m\}$. Q. E. D.

Remark 4.2 By the same arguments, one could prove that the spectrum Σ^* associated to the two-weights problem (1.1) is always at a strictly positive distance from the trivial lines of Σ. In the Dirichlet case, it was proved in [2] that this is true **if and only if** each one of the two weight-functions $m(t)$ and $n(t)$ has a compact support in the interval $]T_1, T_2[$.

References

[1] M. ALIF, Spectre de Fučik : problème avec poids en dimension un et quelques remarques en dimension supérieure, Ph. D. Thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1999.

[2] M. ALIF & J.-P. GOSSEZ, On the Fučik spectrum with indefinite weights, Diff. Int. Equat., to appear.

[3] K. J. BROWN & S. S. LIN, On the existence of positive eigenfunctions for an eigenvalue problem with an indefinite weight function, Mat. Anal. and Appl. 75, 112-120 (1980).

[4] J. CAMPOS, Espectro de Fučik para operadores elipticos, Ph. D. Thesis, Universidad de Granada, 1996.

[5] E. A. CODDINGTON & N. LEVINSON, Theory of ordinary differential equations, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955.

[6] N. DANCER, On the Dirichlet problem for weakly nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations, Proc. Royal Soc., Edimb., 76(1977), 283-300.

[7] P. DRABEK, Solvability and bifurcations of nonlinear equations, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, 264 (1992).

[8] S. FUČIK, Solvability of nonlinear equations and boundary value problems, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1980.

[9] P. HARTMAN, Ordinary differential equations, Wiley, 1964.

[10] P. HESS, On the spectrum of elliptic operators with respect to indefinite weights, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 84(1986), 99-109.

[11] B. RYNNE, The Fučik spectrum of general Sturm-Liouville problems, J. Diff. Equat., to appear.

[12] S. SENN, On a nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problem with Neumann boundary conditions, with an application to population genetics, Comm. in Part. Diff. Eq., 8(11), 1199-1228 (1983).